

UNIVERSITY OF *Minnesota*

MEDICAL SCHOOL
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455
June 12, 1969

Dear Harold,

Received your letters of 6/9 and 6/10. Thanks for the enclosures. By now you should have received a number of things from me under separate cover. The most recent, mailed yesterday, is all yours to keep. Rennar will be sending more on the Alvarez matter, and will either mail it direct to you or send it through me.

Nicel claims to have photos which the Commission didn't use of the cartridges, and he is sending them to Olson. From there they will either be copied for Dick, you, and I, or he will follow my suggestion and send them to me, and I will get them all copied for free, with extra copies for you and Dick, and blowups. It would be interesting to know about photos they didn't use, like why didn't they, whose idea was it, etc.

From George Rennar's last letter to me: "Got a letter from Sylvia wherein she expresses puzzlement at Garrison's continued high praise of her. She says she could understand it before the acquittal, as an attempt to defang her, but not now. She doesn't seem to realize that it just might be an honest opinion. She cites somebody who just got back from New Orleans for a remark by Garrison that all the critics except Salandria let him down."

I am expecting George to send a copy of Boxley's interview with Crisman's buddy in SF, and also some stuff on Buick. George also writes: "A friend of mine has had some access to McNeill Island lately. He met a prisoner who was once a cellmate of Buick in Texas. My friend asked if he ever heard of Buick, and the prisoner's first reaction was, "Oh, that pinko."

On Fred and Dave, they probably do have something to do with turning people off, although the trial did that to many also. One of the reasons that I have continued to bug you for info about squabbles with those two is so that I will be prepared for an instantaneous challenge to anti-Weisberg propaganda as soon as I hear it. Lifton has a way of continually challenging people and harrassing them into changing their views which is surprisingly effective. He has done a great job on Fred, although admittedly, Fred's opinions seem easily changed.

I missed Foreman. I will do my best with Coup, but it was in damn good shape when I went through it. I have not been in touch with Hartmann, Zitch, or Murr, although I did send Murr one note, and made considerable efforts to get his clipping files back for him. Fred was often in touch with Murr, but I know little of the contents, except the letter copies I have which deal with trying to get his files back for him, from Bud, or Trent, or Dick Sprague. Murr was turned off by Dick Bernabei and has dissociated from many others--I will try to find a copy of something on this.

I greatly appreciate the value you obviously place on my opinions by spending so much time detailing your relations with Fred and Dave. I have gotten the feeling from your last 5 or 10 letters that you think I have been swayed by one or both of them which is not the case. I defended you immediately from the outset on all of these things to both of them, even before I knew more than a few details, or in some cases no details, utilizing just straight logic, my association with you and complete faith in you from intensive personal experience, and my association with other critics such as Vince and Sylvia. In addition, much of their flak comes from sources which they themselves normally deride, such as Maggie Field, Ray Marcus, and even Bill O'Connell. During that whole affair with trying to get the Z film from Ray they rejected all of those people, and now they turn around and use loose gossip from the grapevine from those same people. It is almost unbelievable, and I scarcely knew where to begin when trying to point this out to them. Needless to say, neither replied to such things. Fred is capable of amazing outbursts but is a far different figure from Dave who I see as easily sinister.

But Fred is doing some things which may produce useful info, and I think that he really cares, and is not as self-centered as he is incredibly self-conscious, so that I feel comfortable corresponding with him, although he has learned his lesson about defaming you in his letters to me. I think that Dave is a very bad influence on him. More important, however, is

that I send Fred nothing of real importance nor do I discuss it with him, since there would not be any purpose in it, even if he could be trusted to keep a secret, which I don't think he can. Mostly I discuss his work, or things he picks up, etc. A number of good things other than photographic work have been made available, and they have been of varying usefulness. The Jaffe stuff, for instance, and Jaffe's sample of Rose's handwriting. Then there was Lifton's file of clippings which you just got, which neither of us had access to, and which is very useful.

Olson says that Turner doesn't want his correspondence printed, which means though I suppose that you can quote from it anonymously, but with the dates, etc., and then have the documents to back it up. Turner told Olson to write himself, which he is doing, but he hasn't gotten replies yet. With Turner leading him into such correspondence, he might get more info than one of us.

Enclosed is the Reseda file you sent. Thanks. I copied it and now have it on file. I am trying to do some probing of attitudes on Lifton and Fred from those with whom we are both in correspondence, since sometimes people are more frank with me about you, than they would be to your face. This doesn't imply deception, but only that certain things just aren't appropriate. For instance, I can disagree with Fred that you adopt a fatherly or father-knows-best attitude which, although often justified, annoys people. You do not do this with me, but someone like Fred, who does need guidance, reacts violently even to a suggestion of such an attitude. From your letters to me, you were totally unaware of Lillian's very negative attitude towards you. The LA group's manner of dealing with people, their clique, their grapevine, etc. disgusts me. God only knows what they say about me. But it is good to know about such things. Another problem is that sometimes a person has a legitimate gripe which seems excessive, but when the facts are checked is not. Even friends often pass such things off as excessive or not legitimate rather than checking facts. I suspect that Hal Verb occasionally does this and that he may be the guy who has been referred to anonymously by Newcomb and Lifton, although I have no way of knowing for sure, who supposedly agrees with them about things about you. I also strongly suggest that they are grossly distorting. They did this with me. For instance, they said that they had assumed that I had come around to "the correct attitude" about you or an enlightened attitude, because I agreed that you were extremely concerned with people stealing your stuff, etc., although they took it totally out of context besides. I also agreed that you tend to adopt a fatherly attitude, etc., but at the same time noted that it is crazy to allow such a thing to set you off. I tried to show them that all of us have personality quirks which would make it difficult for us to get along with each other if we worried about them, rather than someone's work, and our mutual interests, and that the critics more than any group I have ever known have stupidly let such things destroy their ability to work as a unit. I have pointed out that our own intolerance has done more to hurt work on the case than many of the government best employees and servants and the sycophants.

On Lifton, his answer, which I tore to pieces, on the checking he was supposed to do on Thornley's honesty: "he would tell me practically (meaning you) nothing but one or two minor things which I immediately checked out and found to be trivial." [This refers to your phone call with him.] I said that if something was trivial, it shouldn't have taken a phone call to find that out, only an evaluation before it was checked. Thornley is either honest or dishonest trivial has nothing to do with that. Also: "Bill O Connell tells me this morning [5/31] that Weisberg's version [referring to you being asked to go out and do the job on Liebler] is fantasy, and he used that word. He doesn't know what Weisberg is talking about. Bill, who knew Maggie quite well at the time, can't understand what Weisberg is talking about when he states similar things on Maggie's urging him to come out here. [Lifton writes "re:67,68 trips"--?] Bill says that Weisberg is, at best, exaggerating the significance of some inconsequential formally polite, remark, and ballooning it up all out of proportion. Maggie always felt that Weisberg was trying to get near her manuscript so that he could have a moocher's field day." Then Lifton backs off and mentions that there was a trip by you out there in 1966, and said that you "made a mess of things on the Lomax show."

Also: "Lillian Castellano independently, and on her own, located, dug up, and paid for all the maps she has of Dealy Plaza. At a much later time, Harold sent her one map. She looked at it, immediately noticed that it was already one of the many she had, and sent it back to Harold with a thank you note. (I rechecked the whole story with Lillian this morning.)" I tell you these things not for answers, but so that you have an idea of what certain people say about you, since I am sure that they would never say this to your face. Note that Lifton claims to have recently rechecked those stories. My own reaction is to ignore it as vicious gossip, but you should know the type of venom that some of the quieter ones will spread on request from Lifton of all people. Best wishes. Waste no more time on these people. I have more than enough ammo to do a job on Lifton. Thanks. Gary